

## **MINUTES**

### **Springfield Economic Development Agency Regular Meeting**

May 8, 2006 - 7:00 P.M.

Springfield City Hall – Library Meeting Room  
225 Fifth Street - Springfield

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tammy Fitch, Chair; Anne Ballew, Bill Dwyer, Christine Lundberg, Joe Pishioneri, Dave Ralston, and John Woodrow.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sid Leiken, and Faye Stewart.

STAFF PRESENT: John Tamulonis, Gino Grimaldi

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Tammy Fitch called the Regular Meeting of the Springfield Economic Development Agency (SEDA) to order at 7:25 p.m.

Chairperson Fitch called the roll and stated that a quorum was present.

#### **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Anne Ballew requested that the date of July 19 be changed to June 10 in Paragraph 6 on Page 2 of the minutes of the April 10 SEDA meeting. Chairperson Fitch determined there was no objection to the request and the minutes were amended.

***John Woodrow moved, seconded by Joe Pishioneri, to accept the minutes of the April 10, 2006, meeting, as amended. The motion was adopted unanimously, 6:0.***

#### **III. COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

#### **IV. REPORT OF CHAIR**

None.

#### **V. REPORT OF COMMITTEES**

Mr. Tamulonis reported that the Glenwood Redevelopment Advisory Committee (GRAC) had met on May 2. He said a budget had been prepared for recommendation to the SEDA Budget Committee. He noted that \$250,000 was budgeted for capital improvements. He distributed copies of a document entitled "GRAC Project Ideas from May 2, 2006, Advisory Committee Meeting" and reviewed information regarding possible redevelopment projects and programs for implementation by SEDA. It contained:

- Introductory Housing Improvement Program (FY07 Budget Proposal \$27-41,000)
- 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bike/Trolley Path Improvements (FY07 Budget Proposal \$20-50,000)

Improving Links from New Water Mains to Lateral Distribution Network (FY07 Budget Proposal \$17,000)

- Proposal to Review Possible Solid Waste Management Options (FY07 Budget Proposal \$36,000)
- Begin Planning for Riverfront Redevelopment and Development Westward North of Franklin Boulevard (FY07 Budget Proposal \$30-40,000)

Mr. Tamulonis distributed copies of an April 11, 2006, letter from URS solid waste and management consultants providing details of a proposed study of long-term redevelopment of solid waste and recycling services in the Glenwood area. Bill Dwyer stated that it would be important for Lane County officials to agree to such a study before it was undertaken.

Chairperson Fitch invited members to comment on the projects proposed.

Dave Ralston said he could support all of the suggested projects, but would favor the Bike/Trolley Path more if it were extended across the entire District connecting the bridges from Downtown to Glenwood Boulevard. He asked how participants in a Housing Improvement Program would be chosen. Mr. Tamulonis replied that such a program would likely operate like one already in place that uses Springfield Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. He explained that participants were initially chosen on a first-come-first-served basis and that grant/loans were limited to \$18,500.

Mr. Pishioneri asked if the Springfield Utility District (SUB) would participate in the Water Main Lateral project. Mr. Tamulonis replied that the District had already completed installation of water mains in the area and that laterals and property hookups were normally the responsibility of property owners or developers.

Mr. Pishioneri said he was concerned about access of a Bike/Trolley Path by emergency and public safety vehicles. Mr. Tamulonis replied that one-half block of the proposed Path already existed and that access was controlled/allowed by the installation of appropriate devices, like bollards.

Ms. Ballew said she was concerned about the need for inter-jurisdictional cooperation in the proposed Solid Waste Management. She requested that additional information about options, costs, and needed agreements be prepared for each of the five projects and programs.

Christine Lundberg said she agreed with all of the comments so far made. She said she favored the Housing Improvement Program because it was voluntary. She said she supported the Bike/Trolley Path project to reduce non-motorized traffic on Franklin Boulevard and the Water Main Lateral project because the City needed to participate in development of Glenwood infrastructure.

Chairperson Fitch said she believed members supported all of the identified projects, with a need for more information from Lane County regarding its level of interest in SEDA's working on the URS proposal for reviewing the Solid Waste facility on Glenwood.

## **VI. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Evaluation Criteria and Development Characteristics and Incentives**

Mr. Tamulonis referred to information contained in an Agenda Item Summary requesting guidance on evaluation criteria, development characteristics, and the use of incentives regarding the Glenwood Riverfront Plan. He said the criteria would be used in issuing a revised Request for Interest (RFI) and to judge specific development project proposals.

After discussion, members appeared to reach consensus regarding changes to criteria used in a previous RFI, as follows:

- A. Experience and Qualifications – from 25% to 15%
- B. Financial Resources and Capabilities – from 25% to 30%
- C. Background and Past Performance – unchanged from 25%
- D. Availability – unchanged from 5%
- E. Familiarity with Local Conditions – from 15% to 10%
- F. Management Techniques (add: Relations with Public) – from 5% to 15%

Mr. Tamulonis referred to an attachment to the Agenda Item Summary and asked for preliminary comments on information it contained about incentives that could be offered to developers in the Glenwood Riverfront Plan area.

Ms. Ballew said she was concerned about offering a tax abatement incentive because it was the only revenue source available to the City from development in the area. Mr. Tamulonis said only limited tax abatement was possible and only through the Enterprise Zone program.

Ms. Ballew said it was not clear how System Development Charges (SDCs) reinvestment in a project area could be accomplished. She said she did not understand if the City or SEDA would collect the charges. Mr. Tamulonis explained that SEDA would work with the City as it collects SDCs and then SEDA could request the City make specific expenditures in Glenwood for specific projects in a way similar to CDBG funds the City designates as set-asides for the downtown area.

Chairperson Fitch announced that the SEDA Budget Committee would meet on May 9.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

*(Recorded by Daniel Lindstrom)*

---

Christine Lundberg  
Secretary